



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,414	07/30/2001	Mitsunori Shirato	9333/278	4586

7590 04/20/2006

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

CHANG, SHIRLEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,414	Applicant(s) SHIRATO, MITSUNORI	
	Examiner Shirley Chang	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/24/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2 and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

a. Applicant argues on page 8, first paragraph that Goddard reference does not relate to the display of a plurality of program type identifiers *or* whether one or more of the program type identifiers correspond to a program.

According to applicant's specification, [0032], 'the program type information represents the general content of the programs, or program types, and a plurality of pieces of program type information, or program type identifiers, are associated with a piece of the program information, or program information segments.' Therefore, the program's 'content' are associated with the program information, and Goddard indeed discloses program identifiers.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim(s) 1, 3-7, 9-23 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (6684240) in view of Knudson (6473559).

As to claim 1,

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers ("Exemplary ratings enabled media may include, but are not limited to, broadcast television, cable television services, pay-per-view services, video on demand services, digital satellite television services, DVD, video cassette, laserdisc, radio, cable music services, compact discs (CD), audio cassette tape, the Internet, intranets, and the like" col. 3, lines 55-67);

a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers invalid ("Referring now to FIGS. 1 and 2, exemplary user interfaces of information appliances implementing content control systems employing the present invention are described.

As shown in FIG. 1, an exemplary user interface 100 is displayed to the user by a display device of the information appliance. In one embodiment, such a user interface 100 may include an on-screen control panel 102 for controlling access to media by the information appliance (see FIG. 6). A region or window 104 of the control panel 102 contains therein display fields such as "Channel" 106 and various control buttons or switches such as channel selection 108 & 110, volume 112 & 114, "Settings" 116 and so forth, which function as on-screen visual representations of controls of the

information appliance or, alternately, peripheral devices attached thereto that provide access to one or more media" col. 4, lines 31-45);

an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated invalid by said program type information editing unit ("Preferably, the user commands the content control system to block or unblock the example content at any time during or after accessing (e.g., viewing or listening to) the content, provided additional example content has not been requested. However, in a more flexible embodiment, the content control system may store the identification and content rating of example content provided to the user. In this manner, the user may thereafter choose to block or unblock that content, for instance, after viewing additional content, or before turning off the information appliance providing the content by recalling the identification of the example content from the memory whereupon the content control system may be commanded to block or unblock content similar to the example content. Similarly, in one embodiment, the present invention may allow the user to block or unblock example content without first viewing the content. For example, the user may have prior knowledge of the example content and may wish to adjust the acceptable content rating parameters so content similar to the example content is blocked or unblocked without again viewing the content" col. 7, lines 10-30).

A display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display, a plurality of program type identifiers, and to identify one or more program type identifiers

as being invalid (display system 612, fig 6; display 614, fig. 6; fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45);

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being invalid (fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45) if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers does not correspond to the program information segment (if the program does not meet the standards of the example content of the parental lock levels, the show is blocked, col. 4, lines 31-45).

Goddard teaches blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

Goddard fails to specifically teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit.

In an analogous art, Knudson discloses displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit (col. 8, lines 11-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Goddard's system to teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving

unit, in communication with a display unit, as taught by Knudson, so as to allow parents to block programs that they readily think of, and to also block titles with explicit words.

As to claim 3,

an operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit, wherein said program type information editing unit designates the program type identifier selected by said operating unit invalid (input/output system 616, fig. 6; and as discussed in claim 1);

As to claim 4,

wherein said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers and identifies whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is invalid (figures 4A, 4B, 5; col. 8, lines 5-22; "Consequently, the parent may wish to block access to the television program and other television programs having similar content.

As shown in FIG. 1, the parent selects the "Block/Unblock" button 130 provided in region 104 thereby commanding the parental control system to block the example television program. Alternately, if the parent has requested a television program, and that program is blocked by the parental control system, the parent may enter a password to override the block and view the program. The information appliance may then display the television program within the television viewer region or window 132 of

Art Unit: 2623

the user interface 100. If the parent thereafter determines that the television program was inappropriately blocked, depressing the "Block/Unblock" button 130 will unblock the television program and all similar programs. Again, as discussed more fully above, in exemplary embodiments, the parent may select the "Block/Unblock" button 130 at any time after selecting the television program; i.e., prior to or instead of viewing the program, while viewing of the program, or after viewing the program" col. 8, lines 23-42).

As to claim 5,

a program search processing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program information segments with one or more program type identifiers that correspond to one or more program type identifiers selected by a user ("The hardware system 600 is controlled by a central processing system 602. The central processing system 602 includes a central processing unit such as a microprocessor or microcontroller for executing programs, performing data manipulations and controlling the tasks of the hardware system 600. Communication with the central processor 602 is implemented through a system bus 610 for transferring information among the components of the hardware system 600. The bus 610 may include a data channel for facilitating information transfer between storage and other peripheral components of the hardware system. The bus 610 further provides the set of

Art Unit: 2623

signals required for communication with the central processing system 602 including a data bus, address bus, and control bus" col. 12, lines 40-67).

As to claim 6,

wherein said one or more program type identifiers comprises a first program type identifier and a second program type identifier, said first program type identifier provided by a program provider and said second program type identifier optionally added by a user ("In further examples of the present invention, the content control system may utilize multiple acceptable content rating parameters providing content rating thresholds for media using different rating schemes. When a user views example content in a first media using a first rating scheme and blocks or unblocks the example content causing the system to adjust the acceptable content rating parameter for that media, the acceptable content ratings parameters for media using other ratings schemes may also be adjusted accordingly. This adjustment may be accomplished, in one embodiment, by equating ratings of the various rating schemes utilized by the media. For instance, wherein the media is television employing both the TV parental guideline and MPAA ratings schemes, a TV rating of TV-G may be equated to an MPAA rating of G, a TV rating of TV-PG may be equated to an MPAA rating of PG, and so forth. However, it will be appreciated that the ratings used by one ratings scheme may not necessarily correspond one for one with the ratings used by a second ratings scheme. In such cases, a given rating in one scheme may usually be equated to a more restrictive rating

in a second scheme. Thus, in the proceeding example, a TV-rating of TV-14 may be equated to the slightly more restrictive MPAA rating of PG-13, while a TV-rating of TV-MA may be equated to the more restrictive MPAA rating of R. Thus, wherein an information appliance is capable of accessing multiple media, for example, television, DVD movies, VCR movies, the Internet, and the like, a user may adjust the acceptable content rating parameters for each media based on example content of any one media even though each of the media may employ different ratings schemes" col. 7, line 8 to col. 8, line 5 ; fig. 3; fig. 5).

As to claim 7,

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers; a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to designate at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers valid; an editing result storage unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program type identifiers that have been designated valid by said program type information editing unit (met as discussed in claim 1).

A display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display, a plurality of program type identifiers, and to identify one or more program type identifiers as being invalid (display system 612, fig 6; display 614, fig. 6; fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45);

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being invalid if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers does not specifically disclose correspond to the program information segment (col. 4, lines 31-45).

Goddard teaches blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being invalid if the at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers does not specifically disclose correspond to the program information segment (col. 4, lines 31-45).

Goddard fails to specifically teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit.

In an analogous art, Knudson discloses displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit (col. 8, lines 11-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Goddard's system to teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving

Art Unit: 2623

unit, in communication with a display unit, as taught by Knudson, so as to allow parents to block programs that they readily think of, and to also block titles with explicit words.

As to claim 9,

further comprising: a display unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to display said at least one of said program type identifiers; and an operating unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to select program type identifiers displayed by said display unit, wherein said program type information editing unit designates the program type identifier selected by said operating unit valid (met as discussed in claim 3).

As to claim 10,

said display unit displays text corresponding to at least one of said program type identifiers and identifies whether said at least one of said program type identifiers is valid (met as discussed in claim 4).

As to claim 11,

further comprising a program search processing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to identify program information segments with one or more

Art Unit: 2623

program type identifiers that correspond to one or more program type identifiers selected by a user (met as discussed in claim 5).

As to claim 12,

said one or more program type identifiers comprises a first program type identifier and a second program type identifier, said first program type identifier provided by a program provider and said second program type identifier optionally added by a user (met as discussed in claim 6).

As to claim 13,

a receiving unit operable to receive a plurality of program information segments, each of said plurality of program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers (met as discussed in claim 1);

a program type information editing unit in communication with said receiving unit and operable to associate a program type validity designation with one or more of said plurality of program type identifiers for said plurality of program information segments (met as discussed in claim 1);

an editing result storage unit in communication with said program type information editing unit and operable to store data created by said program type editing information

unit; a display unit in communication with said program type information editing unit and operable to display information corresponding to one or more of said plurality of program type identifiers (met as discussed in claim 1);

an operating unit in communication with said program type information editing unit and operable to allow a user of said receiver to select one or more of said program type identifiers the corresponding information of which is displayed by said display unit (met as discussed in claim 3);

a program search processing unit in communication with said program type editing unit and operable to select program information segments utilizing said program type validity designations (met as discussed in claim 5).

Wherein the program type editing unit designates at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers as being invalid if the program type identifiers corresponds to the program information segment (col. 4, lines 31-45).

As to claim 14,

wherein said receiving unit is a digital broadcast receiving unit ("In embodiments of the invention, the method may be implemented as a program of instructions executable by one or more information appliances including but not limited to digital information appliances" col. 2, lines 53-59).

As to claim 15,

receiving a plurality of program information segments, each of said program information segments being associated with a plurality of program type identifiers; associating a program type validity designation with at least one of said program type identifiers; and storing results of said act of associating a program type validity designation with at least one of said program type identifiers (met as discussed in claim 1).

Displaying a plurality of program type identifiers (display system 612, fig 6; display 614, fig. 6; fig. 1 and 2 show the block/unblock (valid/invalid) of channels, col. 4, lines 31-45);

Identifying one or more program type identifiers as being invalid (col. 4, lines 31-45).

Goddard teaches blocking a program (fig. 4A, el. 408).

Goddard fails to specifically teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit.

In an analogous art, Knudson discloses displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit (col. 8, lines 11-30).

Art Unit: 2623

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Goddard's system to teach displaying a title of a program information segment, received by a receiving unit, in communication with a display unit, as taught by Knudson, so as to allow parents to block programs that they readily think of, and to also block titles with explicit words.

As to claim 16,

said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to a valid identification (met as discussed in claim 6).

As to claim 17,

said program type validity designation comprises a data string corresponding to an invalid identification (met as discussed in claim 6).

As to claim 18,

further comprising the acts of: displaying information corresponding to at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers for said plurality of program information segments; and selecting at least one of said plurality of program type identifiers (met as discussed in claim 3).

As to claim 19,

further comprising the act of distinguishing program identifiers according to a program type validity designations (met as discussed in claim 4).

As to claim 20,

further comprising the act of selecting a subset of program information segments utilizing said program type identifiers and said program type validity designations (met as discussed in claim 5).

As to claim 21,

said plurality of program type identifiers comprise a plurality of first program type identifiers and a plurality of second program type identifiers, said plurality of first program type identifiers being provided by a program provider and said plurality of second program type identifiers being optionally provided by a user (met as discussed in claim 6).

As to claim 22,

Art Unit: 2623

further comprising the act of initially setting all program type validity designations to identify all program type identifiers to be valid (if the user does not block any programs, all programs are "initially set to be valid"; col. 8, lines 5-22).

As to claim 23,

further comprising the act of initially setting all program type validity designations to identify all program type identifiers to be invalid (the user may block all programs col. 8, lines 42-65").

2. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (6684240) in view of Knudson (6473559), and in further view of Kawamura et al. (6535688).

As to claim 2, Goddard discloses:

a front end unit in communication with said antenna (met as discussed in claim 1); a program selector in communication with said signal demodulator ("As used herein, any on-screen graphical object which is described as a button or otherwise said to be selectable or otherwise accessed is intended to refer to on-screen objects which may advantageously be controlled with a pointing device such as a mouse or other device for controlling an on-screen pointer or cursor and generating mouse button events, although it will be recognized that many of such objects may also be made accessible through input via a keyboard, keypad, remote control device, or like input device as

Art Unit: 2623

well" col. 5, lines 5-14); an audio decoder in communication with said program selector (as necessary to output audio data through the speaker; "speaker, audio amplifier" col. 12, lines 40-67); an amplifier in communication with said digital to audio converter; and a speaker in communication with said amplifier ("speaker, audio amplifier" col. 12, lines 40-67). Although Goddard does not specially teach: an antenna; a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit; a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder, Kawamura et al. teaches an antenna television network [0012], a video demodulator [0012], and D/A converter [0014]. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Goddard reference to include an antenna, demodulator, and D/A converter, as to utilize "the convergence of computer and consumer electronics into a single system" col. 12, lines 26-39.

As to claim 8,

said receiving unit comprises: an antenna; a front end unit in communication with said antenna; a signal demodulator in communication with said front end unit; a program selector in communication with said signal demodulator; an audio decoder in communication with said program selector; a digital to audio converter in communication with said audio decoder; an amplifier in communication with said digital to audio converter; and a speaker in communication with said amplifier (met as discussed in claim 2).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shirley Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-8546. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SC


**CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**